



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,491	11/19/2003	Pol Raikin		4510
7590	07/29/2005		EXAMINER	
Pol Raikin Hotel Argaman 65 P.O. Box 2680 Akko, 24126 ISRAEL			ADDIE, RAYMOND W.	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3671	
			DATE MAILED: 07/29/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Notice of Abandonment</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/715,491	RAIKIN, POL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Raymond W. Addie	3671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

This application is abandoned in view of:

1.  Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on 21 December 2004.
  - (a)  A reply was received on 05 July 2005 (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated 05 July 2005), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of 5 month(s)) which expired on 21 June 2004.
  - (b)  A proposed reply was received on \_\_\_\_\_, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection. (A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114).
  - (c)  A reply was received on 06 May 2005 but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below).
  - (d)  No reply has been received.
2.  Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
  - (a)  The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on \_\_\_\_\_ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated \_\_\_\_\_), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
  - (b)  The submitted fee of \$\_\_\_\_\_ is insufficient. A balance of \$\_\_\_\_\_ is due. The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$\_\_\_\_\_. The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c)  The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.
3.  Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).
  - (a)  Proposed corrected drawings were received on \_\_\_\_\_ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated \_\_\_\_\_), which is after the expiration of the period for reply.
  - (b)  No corrected drawings have been received.
4.  The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants.
5.  The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.
6.  The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on \_\_\_\_\_ and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims.
7.  The reason(s) below:

See Continuation Sheet



Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to minimize any negative effects on patent term.

Item 7 - Other reasons for holding abandonment: In the Last Office Action dated 21 Dec 04, Applicant was informed that the multiple inventions claimed, was a burden for the Office to examine and determine patentability of each invention claimed. Applicant was informed that an "election" of one rather than both inventions must be made by Applicant, such that the Office, would then determine the patentability of the "elected invention". Applicants responses filed 5/05 and 7/05, refusing to make such an election, based on the claimed invention being integrally related portions of the same invention; does not satisfy the requirement upon Applicant to elect which of the 2 claimed invention, Applicant wishes the Office to examine and determine, upon the merits, the patentability thereof. Should Applicant wish to further pursue a Utility Patent from the USPTO, Applicant is courteously advised that filing separate applications, for each invention, considered to be patentable by Applicant, might be more appropriate for Applicant's needs. Applicant is further courteously advised to review the USPTO web site at [www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov), to find helpful information, about how to file a patent application and how to respond to Office Actions..